



## MAPBD Points for HB4535

1.) The proposed bills would elevate animal abuse above more serious crimes against people and society. While no one condones animal abuse, establishing this registry would elevate animal abuse above crimes against people such as domestic abuse, child physical abuse, elder abuse and assault - none of which have registries. It would also elevate animal abuse above crimes posing a greater risk to society and with higher rates of recidivism such as drug abuse, drunk driving and arson.

2.) These proposed laws are over reaching. The bills assume that all convicted animal abusers will re-abuse. A significant percentage of animal abuse cases result from either domestic violence or neighbor disputes as acts of vengeance or from acts of hoarding or neglect resulting, not from criminal tendencies, but rather from mental illness. These mental illnesses are better treated within the health community than the penal system. These bills do not differentiate between the acts of wanton animal abusers and misdemeanor neglect that may have a correctible mental health or education component. In 2011, there were 47 cases brought to trial and only 7 felony convictions for animal abuse. These cases represent approximately 0.00047% of Michigan citizens tried and only 0.00007% sentenced to felony conviction. It seems excessive to write legislation for so few cases.

3). These proposed bills are unnecessary, unreasonable, and ineffective. Judges already have full sentencing authority, including terms of probation up to and including life long ineligibility to own an animal. These bills would require anyone moving into the state with any pre-existing abuse conviction to register. How is the new resident to become aware of the existence or requirements of this proposed law? If the purpose is to prevent convicted former abusers from having access to animals, it will be ineffective since only animal control or registered shelters are affected. All the former abuser would have to do would be to go to a retail facility, pet store, private source or auction to obtain an animal or animals. The simplest, safest and least expensive option available to a potential repeat abuse would be to simply trap or lure stray animals or, as was the case with Logan the bills poster dog, abuse someone else's animal.

4). This registry is not financially viable and no fiscal impact studies have yet been completed on these bills. Similar registries have been proposed in 25 states and were rejected due to expected negative fiscal impact and other considerations. Colorado estimated first year cost to be approximately \$200,000.00 and subsequent annual costs to be about \$46,000.00/year. Michigan has about half the population of Colorado and the costs would be proportionately greater. Using the seven felony convictions for animal abuse in Michigan in 2011, the revenues dedicated to the registry would be only \$1,050.00. Even if the statewide conviction for animal abuse, including local citations for misdemeanors, total was ten times higher, the total revenue would be only \$10,500.00. This number falls far below any estimated annual expense.

While no one condones animal abuse and the basis for these bills may be well-intentioned, they do not represent sound, reasonable policy for Michigan. I (we) respectfully request that these bills not be advanced out of this committee.

Thank you.

MAPBD Members

Connie James

Lee Deatruck

Kim Cochran